_***

PTC/SB/21 (09-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2008, OMB 0851-0031
U.S. Petent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filling)		Application Number	09/477,991
		Confirmation Number	1039
			RECEIVED
		Filing Date	01/05/2000 CENTRAL FAX CEN
		First Named Inventor	Bryce A. Jones
		Art Unit	2157 JUL 0 5 200
		Examiner Name	Barbara N. Burgess
Total Number of Pages in This Submission 6		Attorney Docket Number	1264
	ENCLO	SURES (check all that apply)	Communication of the Communica
Fee Transmittal Form	☐ Drawing(s)		☐ After Allowance Communication to TC
Fee Attached	Licensino	-related Papers	Appeal Communication to Board
	I = '		of Appeals and Interferences
Amendment / Reply	Petition		Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
After Final		Convert to a al Application	Proprietary Information
Affidavits/declaration(s)		Attorney, Revocation f Correspondence Address	Status Letter
Extension of Time Request	Terminal (Disclaimer	Other Enclosure(s) (please identifly below):
Express Abandonment Request	Request for Refund		Telephone Interview Summary
	CD, Number of CD(s)		
Information Disclosure Statement	Landscape Table on CD		i
Certified Copy of Priority	Remarks	It is believed that no fees	are due in this matter. However, if it is
Document(s)	determined that fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to debit Deposit Account No. 210765 for the required fees.		
Reply to Missing Parts/			
Incomplete Application			
Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR1,52 or 1,53			
	LATURE OF A	DRUGANT ATTORNEY O	
		PPLICANT, ATTORNEY, O	RAGENI
FIFTE Setter O順a LLC			
Signature Leave un			nsen
Printed Name Gregg L. Jansen		10	
Date July 5, 2005		Reg. No.	46,799
	CERTIFICAT	E OF TRANSMISSION/MAI	ILING
hereby certify that this corresponder Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 14	ice is being fac 50, Alexandria,	simile transmitted to the USPT VA 22313-1450 on the date sho	O to Fax. No. 703-872-9306 addressed to: wn below.
Signature	Dir Mr	- Juno	
Typed or printed name Julia M. J	ung	14.0	Date July 5, 2005

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. The will vary depending upon the individual case, Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS, SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9109 and select option 2.

RECEIVED IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICEENTRAL FAX CENTER

In re application of: Bryce A. Jones

JUL 0 5 2005

Application No.: 09/477,991

Group No.: 2157

Filed: January 5, 2000

Examiner: Barbara N. Burgess

For: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR PROCESSING WEB CALLS IN A

WEB CALL CENTER

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicant submits this telephone interview summary to meet the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.133(b), and according to the requirements listed in MPEP § 713.04.

<u>Date/Type of Interview:</u> Telephone interview conducted on June 28, 2005

Examiner: Barbara Burgess (571) 272-3996

Name of Applicant's attorney: Gregg Jansen (303) 938-9999, ext. 14

Exhibits shown or demonstrations conducted:

An agenda was faxed to Examiner Burgess at fax number (571) 273-3996 on Monday, June 20, 2005. The agenda included independent claim 146 and portions of the recently received Office Action regarding the last claim element of claim 146.

Claims discussed: Claim 146

Prior art discussed: Goss, U.S. Patent No. 6,493,447

General thrust of Examiner's arguments:

Examiner Burgess stated that the steps of generating routing information and transferring the routing information do not explicitly include elements of actually completing a connection.

Examiner Burgess stated that the steps of generating routing information and transferring the routing information do not explicitly process information from a cookie.

General thrust of Applicant's arguments:

The invention uses information in a cookie to select a web call center resource, as embodied in claim 146. The invention further uses the cookie information to extend the web call (originating from the user device) to the

selected web call resource. The original call is never dropped or terminated, and the claims are not concerned with a later call back.

Goss discloses a "call-back request". This terminology indicates that the original call is not completed to an agent. Goss does not extend the original call from the caller. In Goss, the caller registers a call-back request and subsequently an agent calls back at a later time.

Attorney Jansen stated that the claims do not need to claim explicit connecting steps or elements. The provision of routing information to the appropriate network is sufficient for completing the extension of the call to the selected web call resource.

Attorney Jansen stated that the cookie information does not need to be explicitly included in the elements of steps of generating routing information and transferring the routing information. Attorney Jansen stated that a call source and a call destination are known after a web call resource is selected due to the processing of the cookie. Generating the routing information can be performed from the source and destination information.

Applicant's arguments followed the material of the previously submitted agenda, enclosed.

Agreement reached and general nature of the agreement: None

Proposed amendments: None

Other pertinent matters:

Attorney Jansen asked whether Examiner Burgess would consider claim 146 to be patentable if claim 146 was amended to state that the step of generating routing information included information from the cookie. Examiner Burgess responded that she would have to see a formal amendment submission in order to make such a determination.

Date: 7/5/05

Gregg Jansen, Reg. No. 46,799

Setter Ollila LLC

Telephone: (303) 938-9999 ext. 14

Facsimile: (303) 938-9995

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 028004

Harley R. Ball Sprint Law Department 6391 Sprint Parkway

Mailstop: KSOPHT0101-Z2100 Overland Park, KS 66251-2100 Enclosure: Telephone Interview Agenda of 6/20/05

TELEPHONE CONFERENCE AGENDA

To: Examiner Barbara Burgess, Fax (571) 273-3996

From: Gregg Jansen, Setter Ollila LLC, Tele (303) 938-9999 ext. 14

Date: June 20, 2005

Re: 09/477,991 Method and Apparatus for Processing Web Calls in a Web Call Center

Scheduled Teleconference: Tuesday, June 28, 2005, at 1:00 Eastern, 11:00 Mountain

time

Items to be Discussed:

- Independent method claim 146 (representative claim)
- Goss prior art patent 6,493,447
- Differences between claim 146 and Goss
- Further examination of the patent application

Independent claim 1

146. (Newly presented in RCE) A method of operating a communication system to route web calls to a web call center including a plurality of web call resources to handle the web calls, the method comprising:

receiving a web call for the web call center, wherein the web call originates from a user device;

processing a cookie for the user device to select one of the web call resources to handle the web call originating from the user device;

generating routing information for the web call originating from the user device to the selected web call resource; and

transferring the routing information to extend the web call originating from the user device to the selected web call resource.

Office Action:

Applicant requested a telephone conference in order to move the application to a final resolution and to preclude the necessity of filing an Appeal. The above amended claim was presented in the previous response in order to more clearly definite the

invention. However, the received Office Action still cites the same portions of Goss and still rejects the claims as being anticipated by Goss, despite the fact that the current claims include limitations that are clearly not included in Goss.

For example, the recently received Office Action states that Goss discloses "transferring the routing information to extend the web call <u>originating from the user</u> device to the selected web call resource" (emphasis added). The Office Action cites col. 6, lines 35-44, 56-61, and col. 7, lines 1-5 in support of this assertion.

However, Goss does not disclose this element of claims 146 and 156. In the cited text (and elsewhere), Goss discloses that an incoming call can request a callback. A callback is NOT performed using the connection established by the requesting person. The term "callback" alone denotes that a current connection from the person to the Intranet Server 66 in Goss is not maintained and/or extended. The original call from the person to the call center is dropped after the person leaves a callback request (see col. 7, lines 26-29 and 55-58). At a later time, in a separate and distinct telephone call, an available agent generates a NEW call to the requesting person (see col. 7, lines 3-5). This claim element was strictly defined in the last amendment, and simply does not exist in Goss. Goss does not receive a call and extend the very same call to a selected web resource, based on routing information generated from a cookie.